

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Lesby Banegas

Plaintiff,

—v—

The Mirador Corp., et al.,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOCKET  
DATE FILED: May 17, 2017

14-cv-8491 (AJN)

MEMORANDUM &  
ORDER

ALISON J. NATHAN, District Judge:

On October 23, 2014, Plaintiff Lesby Banegas filed a complaint in the Southern District of New York alleging violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*, the New York Labor Law (“NYLL”), Art. 19 § 650 *et seq.*, and state and local antidiscrimination laws. Dkt. No. 1 (“Compl.”). On August 21, 2015, the parties reported that they had reached a settlement. Dkt. No. 23. The Court thereafter instructed the parties to submit their settlement, along with a joint letter explaining why the settlement should be approved, so that the Court could review the settlement to ensure that it is fair and reasonable, in accordance with *Cheeks v. Freeport Pancake House, Inc.*, 796 F.3d 199 (2d Cir. 2015). Dkt. No. 24. On April 12, 2016, the Court declined to approve the settlement, citing a number of concerns. Dkt. No. 28.

On May 20, 2016, the parties resubmitted the settlement, addressing each of the Court’s concerns. *See* Dkt. No. 33.

Finding the settlement, in its present form, fair and reasonable, the Court hereby approves the settlement.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Court’s previous order declining to approve the settlement, the Court noted that the parties had publicly-filed redacted versions of certain documents without complying with Rule 4.A of this Court’s Individual Practices in Civil Cases. *See* Dkt. No. 28 at 3 n.1. In their May 20, 2016 submission, the parties redact Exhibit D,

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 17, 2017  
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Nathan", written over a horizontal line.

ALISON J. NATHAN  
United States District Judge

---

including the Plaintiffs' counsel's billing records. Plaintiffs' counsel is ordered to submit a letter to the Court, on or before May 31, 2017, justifying why the exhibit should be wholly redacted in light of the Second Circuit's decision in *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2006). In the alternative, Plaintiff's counsel may file an unredacted version of the exhibit on the docket on or before that date.